



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The

American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION IN CHICAGO

TWO previous meetings of the American Historical Association had been held in Chicago. That of 1893 occurred in the summer, in connection with the great World's Fair then in progress, and was much overshadowed by that event, with whose brilliant attractions it was impossible for history to compete. That of December, 1904, opening with a blizzard which figures in the memory of those present so vividly as to obscure remembrance of the fine weather that followed, suffered from the amiable attempt toward "recognizing" various institutions by holding sessions in too many places. In the Chicago December, institutions in which such sessions may be held are separated from one another by bleak miles of wintry air, moving with notorious velocity. The committee charged with the arrangements for the sessions of December, 1914, wisely arranged that, so far as was possible, they should all be held under one roof, that of the Auditorium Hotel. Here there were most ample facilities for the holding of sessions large and small, for committee meetings, and for conversation; apparently there has never been a meeting more notable for social pleasure of members with members. Entertainments on the part of the city were wisely kept, by the committee on arrangements, to a minimum of what was offered—a luncheon on the first day, a reception on the first evening, tendered by the Art Institute of Chicago, a tea by the Chicago College Club, and a smoker by the University Club. The Caxton Club and the Chicago Literary Club threw open their rooms, the Chicago Historical Society its building; the Newberry Library gave a special exhibition of rare Americana drawn from the wonderful collection presented to it by the munificence of Mr. Edward E. Ayer.

The only sessions held outside the walls of the Auditorium Hotel and the Fine Arts Building connected with it were those of the first two evenings, when provision had to be made for larger popular audiences. These sessions were held near by, in Fullerton Hall of the Art Institute of Chicago. On the first, there was an address of welcome by Mr. Charles L. Hutchinson, chairman of the local committee of arrangements, followed by the presidential address of Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, of the University of Chicago, president of the Association, which, under the title "American History and American Democracy", we have had the pleasure of printing in our January issue. The exercises were followed by a most agreeable reception, held amid the impressive treasures of Chicago's remarkable art collection. On all these occasions, and throughout the whole meeting, the careful fore-thought of the local committee of arrangements, of its chairman, and of its secretary, Professor James A. James, of Northwestern University, were everywhere apparent.

With them should be joined, in the grateful recollection of the members, the committee on the programme, and its chairman, Professor James W. Thompson, of the University of Chicago; and first, because of the relative simplicity of the programme. With one exception, made for special reasons, there was no time when more than two sessions or sections were going on simultaneously. Abundance of time, the whole of the second afternoon, was allowed for the annual business meeting, in whose proceedings the lack of time has often bred a rate of speed savoring too much of mechanism. There were sessions or sections devoted to ancient history, to medieval history, to the medieval history of England in particular, to modern English history, to the history of Napoleonic Europe, to the history of the relations between Europe and the Orient, and to American history. There was a joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, devoted to Western history, the usual conference of the representatives of historical societies, and the usual conference of archivists; while the second evening session was general in character, assembling several papers having especial attraction for a public audience.

It is of some interest to compare the programme with that of the meeting held ten years ago in the same city. The most noteworthy feature of the earlier occasion was the presence of several noted European historical scholars—Païs and Keutgen and Milioukov; the condition of Europe, oppressed by warfare of the most appalling magnitude, put all such visits out of the question in the

present year. The meeting of 1904 was held in conjunction with the American Economic Association and the American Political Science Association; the recent meeting was confined to history (though the Political Science Association was meeting in an adjoining hotel), and no other society was present save the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. Several papers on that former occasion dealt with European archives; the annual conference of archivists, which in recent years has been so useful, had not then been founded. The conference of state and local historical societies, on the other hand, a gathering which has less completely vindicated its claim to practical importance yet has not been without results, dates its inception from 1904. Practical conferences of teachers were then more in vogue, and three were held on that occasion, for the consideration of the teaching of history in elementary schools, of the doctoral dissertation, and of the teaching of church history respectively. One such conference has usually been maintained in the subsequent meetings, with some useful effects and some threshing of old pedagogical straw; this year there was none.

The attendance upon the meeting was unusually large. The registration was recorded as 400, and has been surpassed in only two cases, that of the New York meeting of 1909, the Association's twenty-fifth anniversary, and that of the Boston meeting of 1912. Naturally, the attendance was chiefly from the Middle West, but not a few came from New York and the East.

The general organization of the programme has already been described, and it may be as well, when considering it in detail, to proceed rather in the natural or chronological order of the papers than in the order in which they were arranged on the programme. First among the papers in ancient history would come, in such an arrangement, one which did not figure in the conference or section of ancient history, but was given separately, as a brief illustrated lecture before the more public audience of the second evening, Professor James H. Breasted's brilliant talk on the Eastern Mediterranean and the Earliest Civilizations in Europe. Beginning with a time when all Europe was in a stage of neolithic barbarism, and when, in the thirtieth century B. C., Egypt was the one thoroughly centralized and highly civilized state bordering on the Mediterranean, he made a selection from among the surviving material evidences which show the existence and character of the cultural influences setting from the Orient toward Europe. In the main, this was achieved by exhibiting a number of architectural sequences of which the earlier members were found in the ancient Orient,

while the later, passing to Europe, furnished fundamental forms to European civilization—the clerestory and the basilica, the Assyrian palace front and the Roman triumphal arch, the Babylonian temple tower and the Christian church spire. The forms of writing, the conceptions and emblems of the state, were marshalled in series with similar ingenuity. With only selected fragments of the evidence, and with long gaps between, it was impossible for the address to be always convincing, but it was always instructive and illuminating.

In the conference proper on ancient history, the first paper read was that of Professor Robert W. Rogers of Drew Theological Seminary, entitled Fresh Light upon the History of the Earliest Assyrian Period. Mr. Wallace E. Caldwell, fellow in Columbia University, discussed the Greek Attitude towards Peace and War. The earlier Greek poets were in general warlike in sympathies and expression. With the beginning of the fifth century this attitude changed. The poets praised the glories and blessings of peace and set forth in telling phrases the horrors of war, particularly the sufferings caused by the loss of the city's finest men. A feeling for humanity and a breadth of view that sympathized with the sufferings on both sides developed during the Peloponnesian War. During the fourth century the economic arguments as to loss through interference with business and the burdens of war taxes were more prominently advanced. At the same time there came more widespread attempts to prevent war through peace conferences and arbitration, which pointed also to a growing community of interests that made peace more necessary. The modernness of the points of view and of the arguments for peace and against war were made particularly evident.

Dr. William D. Gray of Smith College, in a paper on Hadrian and his Reign, put forth the view that the cosmopolitanism of Hadrian has been exaggerated. One of his main purposes was to protect the Greco-Roman civilization of the Roman empire from corrupting influences—particularly from the influences of northern barbarism and of Orientalism—and to give to this civilization a more Roman character. This purpose can be traced in his surrender of Trajan's conquests, in frontier lines designed to exclude barbarian influences, in the military reforms by which he endeavored to restore the Roman character and discipline to the army, in his reforms in Rome and Italy, in his provincial administration, and in his Roman and somewhat anti-Oriental religious policy. But his immediate successors did not adopt his methods, his later suc-

cessors did not share his ideas. As a political innovator Hadrian is perhaps the forerunner of the later empire, but as the defender of a civilization he is one of the last great representatives of classical antiquity.

The paper by Professor William L. Westermann of the University of Wisconsin, on the Decline of Ancient Culture, we shall have the pleasure of printing in this journal, at a later time. For the present it may suffice to say that, rejecting for various reasons six explanations currently offered for the decline of the classical civilization—slavery, depopulation, taxation, the drain of the precious metals to India, Christianity, and the entrance of the barbarians into the Roman Empire—he resorted to economic considerations resting on the antithesis between two concurrent systems, not adjusted into harmony by the Romans, that of the industrial city, inherited from the Greeks, and that of the great agricultural estate, inherited from the Hellenistic rulers, and developing into the imperial domain. Decline of industrial freedom, lessened production, reversion to an economy injurious to intellectual vigor and initiative, preceded the decline of ancient culture.

An advanced moment in medieval culture was dealt with in a paper by Professor Edgar H. McNeal of the Ohio State University, on the Feudal Noble and the Church as reflected in the Poems of Chrestien de Troyes. Of the same period was the essay by Professor Frederic Duncalf of the University of Texas, on Some Effects of Environment in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The Europeans, who attempted to found colonies in Syria in the twelfth century, had none of the preparation for such a task that a more advanced civilization might have given. In the most difficult phase of their task, relationship with the Oriental peoples, they were most successful. They learned toleration and appreciation, and even generosity as rulers. Alliances with the Mohammedans furthered friendly relations. If the colonists never obtained any real understanding of Eastern character they gained a practical knowledge of the East, adapting themselves in many ways to their environment, despite constant interference by the less appreciative pilgrims coming afresh from the West. Their great failure is to be found in the type of government that they established in the East, for the Crusades developed individualism to such a degree that the colonies failed to establish a strong, centralized government, although the frontier situation demanded such unity.

Under the title "Roger Bacon, 1214-1914", Professor Earle W. Dow of Michigan presented a commemorative essay, apropos

of the seventh centenary of Bacon's birth. In the light of Bacon's principal writings and of recent studies, he traced his intellectual formation and the main lines of his thinking, and considered the quality of his achievement. Despite the limits to that accomplishment which various students have lately pointed out, the fullness and grasp of Bacon's knowledge, the problems and suggestions he passed to others, and his appreciation of the power of observation and experiment, give him a significant part in the earlier development of modern science. And yet it may be more just to Bacon to regard his effort and achievement as lying primarily in the human field—to enroll him chiefly among those who studied to find solutions for pressing problems in the conduct of human affairs.

To illustrate the use which may be made of the material bearing upon the papal tax on clerical incomes, Professor Lunt of Cornell presented, under the title Papal Finance and Papal Diplomacy in the Thirteenth Century, an account of the tax imposed by Gregory X. in 1274 and the opposition to it. The tenth of England, Wales, Ireland, and perhaps Scotland, was to go to Edward I. provided he undertook a crusade. This he announced in 1283 that he could not do. Later he agreed to take the cross, and asked that the tenth be granted to him. The result of the long negotiation which followed was that he received from the pope a grant, though he did not undertake the crusade. The papacy had paid the expenses of collection, and had borne the brunt of the opposition to the tax, while the king had acquired the larger part of the revenue.

In a session devoted to medieval England, four papers were read. We summarize first that of Professor James F. Willard of the University of Colorado, on a Reform of the Exchequer under Edward I. During the first half of that reign, the revenues of the crown were received by two departments of the government, the exchequer of receipt, or lower exchequer, and the wardrobe, the ordinary revenue flowing in general into the lower exchequer and the extraordinary revenue into the wardrobe, which normally received the greater part of the income of the crown. In 1290, under the direction of William de Marchia, the newly appointed treasurer of the exchequer, a revolution was brought about which has hitherto escaped the notice of financial historians. Thereafter the exchequer of receipt was the department of the government into which the greater part of both the ordinary and extraordinary revenue flowed. This revolution laid the foundation for the future importance of the lower exchequer; it was accompanied by the appearance of several new series of financial records.

The second paper of the group, by Miss Bertha H. Putnam of Mount Holyoke College, related to Minimum Wage Laws for Priests after the Black Death, 1346-1381. A large proportion of the stipendiary clergy died during the great plague; the survivors attempted to benefit from the national calamity by obtaining increased salaries, precisely as the laboring classes were endeavoring to secure higher wages. Thereupon the great ecclesiastics framed canons specifying maximum salaries for priests, closely resembling the maximum wage laws for laborers, passed by Parliament. By means of manuscript and printed ecclesiastical sources such as the episcopal registers, Miss Putnam followed out the administrative enforcement of these regulations and the legal problems, such as those relating to conflict of jurisdiction. We print her paper in a later number.

A paper by Professor N. M. Trenholme of Missouri, on Municipal Aspects of the Rising of 1381 in England, attempted to bring out in a definite way the important part played by the towns of southeastern England, especially London, in the great popular uprising. The writer took the position that the agrarian discontent was fomented and developed by dissatisfied and radical townsmen. A second and more important matter was the co-operation of the inhabitants of the towns in the revolt, greatly increasing the popular army which advanced on London. In the case of London itself, it was pointed out how a radical element of the *Victuallers' party*, then in control of the city government, admitted the mob from outside, and how many of the lower elements of London society joined the rebels. Municipal disorders in outside royal boroughs and in towns under mesne lordship were briefly referred to, and the somewhat negative municipal results of the rising were commented on.

Last in this group of papers was one by Professor James F. Baldwin of Vassar College, on Historic Cases before the King's Council. The records of the council abound in cases which are a reflection of the political and social interests of their time. As an example, the case of *Ughtred v. Musgrave* in 1366 may be taken as a segment of the history of the sheriff—a case in which the council, after a searching examination of specific charges, condemned the influential sheriff of Yorkshire for arresting men without warrant, indictment, or other process of law. It was because of such abuses of power, which were possible through the packing of juries and the procuring of indictments, that the judicial functions of the sheriffs were gradually reduced and given over mainly to the justices of the peace. These materials are valuable not only

for the history of law, but also for the general historian, and even have their uses for the legal reformer.

The paper by Professor Albert H. Lybyer of Illinois, on the Influence of the Rise of the Ottoman Turks upon the Routes of Oriental Trade, showed that, contrary to a view which has often prevailed, the Ottoman Turks did not greatly, if at all on the whole, increase the difficulties of Oriental traffic or make imperative the discovery of the new routes of trade to the East. Indirect evidence is found in the prices of spices in Western Europe, which were not permanently raised before the year 1500. The legend of the Turkish responsibility for the great maritime discoveries—held by Thorold Rogers in opposition to the evidence which his own statistics afford—seems a survival of the belief that the fall of Constantinople was the determining event of modern history. In the latter part of the paper the author reviewed the course of Oriental trade from the time of the great crusades, showing the actual influence exercised upon it by the Turks.

For the period between the medieval and the modern, there was a valuable paper by Mr. A. Edward Harvey of Chicago, on Economic Self-Interest in the German Anti-Clericalism of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. The influence of papal exactions is familiar; but other subjects of common complaint were the tithes, feudal dues and services, charges for the sacraments or other religious performances of the priests, and a multitude of “voluntary” offerings urged by the secular clergy as well as by mendicant friars and nuns. Less familiar were the endowments for anniversaries and other services for the dead, the mortgages requiring perpetual annual payments, the burdens of lease-rents, the exemption of the clergy from taxes and tolls and import-duties, and the resulting damage to municipal revenues and to competing merchants and craftsmen. While other motives for anti-clericalism are equally discernible, the economic factor was much more widely operative in the success of Protestantism than historians have heretofore been able or willing to concede.

In a paper entitled “The Turco-Venetian Treaty of 1540” Mr. Theodore F. Jones of the University of New York sketched, largely from letters in Venetian archives, the course of the negotiations between Venice and Turkey from 1538 to 1540. He also showed how the final diplomatic defeat of Venice—which was compelled to surrender her Levantine seaports, and pay a large indemnity to Turkey—was probably due to the treachery of secretaries of the Seigniory, as a result of which the secret instructions of the Vene-

tian envoy were brought, through the agency of the French ambassador, to the knowledge of the Turkish government. He further suggested how, apparently, evidence of this treachery came to light and resulted in the punishment of some of the wrongdoers.

In a session devoted to the history of modern England four papers were read, chiefly relating to the constitutional history of the seventeenth century. Professor Henry R. Shipman of Princeton presented the subject of the House of Commons and Disputed Elections, as an illustration of the development of parliamentary privilege in general. Beginning with a detailed description of the Norfolk election case of 1586, and with allusion to other instances in the last years of Queen Elizabeth, he discussed the doctrine concerning the rights of the Commons laid down by that body in the Fortescue and Goodwin case (1604) and showed the Commons' assertion as to ancient privilege to be without foundation. The Aylesbury election cases in 1704 and that of John Wilkes's re-election in 1770 were used to illustrate the conflicts between the House and the courts. The paper concluded by showing that the underlying cause of the contests was the multiplicity of laws existing together, the law of Parliament and the common law conflicting because the lines between the legislative and the judicial powers of Parliament had not been clearly drawn.

The paper by Professor Edward R. Turner of Michigan, on the Privy Council of 1679, was a discussion of the authorship, purposes, and results of the sudden substitution by Charles II., for the old privy council, of a lesser body of thirty, consisting only partly of the old members. Temple claims the authorship, and probably put the plan into form. The motive was political, King Charles, in dire straits, trying to placate critics by the change but not intending to abandon the practice of holding private meetings of a select and governing few. The results were disappointing. Parliament received the innovation coldly, the friends of royalty felt aggrieved, the procedure soon came to be much the same as before, and the king soon treated the new council with neglect.

In treating the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and the Revolution of 1689, Professor Clarence C. Crawford, of the University of Kansas, called attention first to the close relation between the struggle for constitutional restrictions upon the royal prerogative and the establishment of the guarantees of personal liberty. The paper discussed the legal principles involved in the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, the conditions which were believed to justify the arbitrary power of arresting persons upon suspicion of high

treason and holding them in prison without benefit of bail or trial, and the methods by which that power was exercised. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended at nine different periods between 1689 and 1818. The methods and practices employed in 1689, when the machinery of government was badly deranged by the Revolution, were made the precedent for all subsequent suspensions of the act.

The fourth of the papers in the session for modern English history, that of Professor Herbert C. Bell of Bowdoin College, on British Commercial Policy in the West Indies, 1783-1793, dealt with the regulation by the British government of the trade between the United States and the British West Indies. The scarcity of food and lumber in the West Indies during the Revolutionary War gave additional ground for the assumption that the islands must be permitted to trade freely in raw produce with the United States. But such a departure from the principles of the old commercial system was strongly opposed, particularly by ship-owners and by those who apprehended American competition. Pitt's attempt, in the Shelburne administration, to open the trade to the Americans without restriction, was defeated. Under the Coalition, the wishes of Fox were overborne by the North section of the Cabinet, and the American trade was confined to British ships. Pitt, on becoming prime minister, held a careful investigation, which resulted in the vindication, retention, and permanent adoption of the system established by the Coalition, a system advantageous to both planters and ship-owners.

Two sessions were devoted to the history of Napoleonic Europe, not unreasonably in view of the centenary of 1815, however different the manner in which that centenary is observed in the world at large from what was expected when the programme was first framed. The first of these sessions was devoted to the reading of papers, without discussion—which indeed was the prevailing method in the Chicago sessions; the other was a practical conference. In the former, one paper, that of Professor Guy S. Ford of Minnesota, printed on a later page, related to a subject in Prussian history of the Napoleonic period, Boyen's military law; the other two were of French themes, *An Approach to a Study of Napoleon's Generalship*, by Professor R. M. Johnston of Harvard, and the *Senate of the First Empire*, by Professor Victor Coffin of Wisconsin.

Mr. Johnston declared that a study of Napoleon's generalship should pursue three lines: first, what Napoleon learned of the art of war as it existed in his youth; second, what came from his per-

sonal genius; third, what came from the French Revolution. The stress should be laid, in the first division of the study, on the improvements in artillery which took place between 1763 and 1792: the field pieces were made lighter, muzzle velocities increased, and the use of grape-shot developed. In the second division of the study, the "geometrical bias" of Napoleon's mind and his "psychologico-dramatic sense" are the qualities which seem to differentiate him from other generals. And lastly, the French Revolution had broken down army discipline, had encouraged individual intelligence and initiative. A study of Napoleon's career as a whole shows that he failed to keep pace with the new school of warfare which was developing.

Mr. Coffin, in his study of the imperial Senate, described his subject as of interest rather from the political than the institutional point of view; the tracing of its construction and manipulation throws a flood of light on the whole imperial system. But the decline of the Senate from the position assigned to it by Siéyès to a condition of absorption by the executive, is accompanied by the assignment to it, as a trusty agent, of a constitutional authority beyond even that intended by Siéyès, and of administrative functions of unusual interest. The former was an amplification of the powers indicated by the term *Sénat Conservateur*; the latter were associated with these powers and were operated through the establishment of the *Senatorialies*. In the divisions of the Empire so-named (33 in number) the leading Senators exercised a confidential supervision over all public authorities and activities; the periodical reports that form the record of this supervision constitute an unused and valuable source of information as to the conditions of the period.

In the practical conference, already mentioned, the principal paper was presented by Professor George M. Dutcher of Wesleyan University, on Tendencies and Opportunities in Napoleonic Studies. The wealth of contemporary materials and the widespread interest of the French in their great popular movement, the French Revolution, were contrasted with the scantier materials and the lesser interest in the Napoleonic period, while in the other European countries the period of the monarchical struggle against the French Revolution has lacked materials and interest in comparison with the period of the national struggles against Napoleon. The progress of French writings regarding the Napoleonic era, and of writings in other countries, down to 1891, was recounted. Various causes have made the period since 1891 the period of monographs and the

period of most widespread interest in Napoleonic studies. In that year were published the memoirs of Marbot and Talleyrand, and the remarkable monographs of Vandal and Tatistcheff on Napoleon and the Tsar Alexander. The publications in each country since 1891 were then reviewed, with especially full attention to those of France. While military and biographical subjects had been the main interest during the earlier periods, the present period has been marked by increasing attention to diplomatic, religious, economic, administrative, social, and other aspects of the Napoleonic period.

In closing, the speaker referred to the library facilities in the United States for Napoleonic studies, to the varying degrees of attention given to the study of the period in American colleges and universities, and finally to the almost total neglect of the period as a subject for doctoral dissertations, except by Professor Lingelbach of the University of Pennsylvania. Professor Lingelbach then discussed some of the most important economic studies of the period written in Europe, and emphasized the opportunities for Napoleonic studies in this country. Professor Ford of Minnesota referred to the German phases of the period, but laid stress on the necessity for avoiding narrow views in its study, and for considering the broader relations and currents of historical development. In a similar spirit Professor Morse Stephens urged the study of the period not as the history of Napoleon, or of France, or of any single nation, but as a complete whole.

Professor Colby's paper on the Early Relations of England and Belgium dealt chiefly with events which fall between 1788 and 1870. The first incident to be considered was the revolt of the Austrian Netherlands in 1789-1790. This subject was approached from the standpoint of English relations with Prussia, as reflecting Pitt's unwillingness that the Belgian seacoast should be held either by a power unfriendly to England or by a power so weak as to invite attack. Reference was also made to the bearing which the Belgian situation had on England's attitude towards Prussian ambitions regarding Danzig and Thorn. The greater part of the paper, however, was concerned with the share which England took in events consequent to the Belgian Revolution of 1830. The negotiations between Palmerston and Talleyrand were considered in some detail, both as affecting the neutralization of Belgium and as related to the desire of the forward party in France to secure a portion of the Belgian soil through rectification of the frontier. The subsequent development of English public opinion regarding Belgium was also touched on, and a concluding statement was made as to the attitude

of Disraeli and Gladstone towards Belgian neutrality, at the outbreak of the Franco-German War. With some changes of form, the paper will appear later in this journal.

Last among the papers in European history we may mention two which dealt with Russian affairs. Dr. Robert H. Lord of Harvard treated of the Winning of the Amur, one of the principal achievements of Russian diplomacy and a landmark in the history of Russian expansion. The process of acquisition was begun by General Nicholas Muraviev, who became governor-general in 1847 and at once perceived the vast importance to Russia of the possession of the region. Despite the protests of China and the timidity of St. Petersburg, in a few years Russia was in actual possession, and in 1858, by virtue of the conditions due to the Taiping rebellion and the Anglo-French war with China, Muraviev obtained a treaty confirming the possession. But the Chinese government repudiated the treaty, and it became the task of General Nicholas Ignatiev, who was sent to China in the spring of 1859, to obtain a definitive ratification of the cession. During some months Ignatiev was unsuccessful; then, the Anglo-French expedition to Peking gave him his opportunity. By insinuating himself into the confidence of the French and British representatives and utilizing the helplessness of the Chinese and working especially upon their fears, he was able practically to formulate the agreement concluded between the Chinese and the allies, and then to obtain for Russia even more than had hitherto been demanded—including acclamations of gratitude from his victims.

The paper by Professor Samuel N. Harper of Chicago, on the "Russian Nationalists", or government party in the Duma, traced the origin of that party back to the official nationalism—"Russia for the Russians"—which existed in autocratic Russia at the end of the nineteenth century, and was itself an outgrowth of Slavophilism. He showed how those representing this variety of opinion, though numerically weak, had been able to acquire power through the reaction against the movements of 1905, and to throw discredit on the non-Russian nationalities of the Empire. He described the legislative restrictions upon Poles, Finns, and other non-Russian elements, which had flowed from this spirit of exclusive nationalism, and the constant protests of the Liberals against it as essentially foreign to the Russian genius.

In American history, one of the most notable papers, surely, was that in which Professor Frederick J. Turner of Harvard analyzed in various fields the Significance of Sectionalism in American His-

tory. This we hope to have the pleasure of presenting to our readers before long.

A regional matter of much interest was discussed in the joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association by Professor Royal B. Way of Northwestern University. His paper on English Relations in the Northwest, 1789-1794, took issue with that on the Western Posts and the British Debts which Professor McLaughlin contributed to the proceedings of 1894. The writer believed that British conduct in that period was more open to criticism. He held that the British officials continually deceived the Indians as to the provisions of the treaty of 1783 in respect to Indian lands in the Ohio valley, persisted in a policy of consolidation of Indian tribes for English advantage, extended their trade and established new posts, blocked peace between the Indians and the United States, and by timely supplies aided the Indian warfare.

Professor Max Farrand of Yale, in a paper entitled "One Hundred Years Ago", read in a session specially devoted to American history, described how, just after the War of 1812, there emerged a growing democracy, first becoming conscious of its power. The European wars and the resulting commercial legislation of the United States led to a national protective tariff system. Population moved rapidly westward, and easier communication between East and West became a necessity. There developed in the Middle West a conscious nationality and a national type, which began to express itself in a national literature. A change in religious thinking, greater tolerance, less attention to theological abstractions, mark the period. The effect of the invention of the cotton gin on slavery is a commonplace; the effect of slavery on cotton growing was just as important. But the greatest force at work in the creation of a nation was the development of an internal commerce, which brought with it a feeling of national completeness.

Dr. Henry B. Learned's account of Cabinet Meetings under Polk was based largely on Polk's *Diary*, which reveals glimpses of nearly four hundred sessions, held twice a week with remarkable regularity. They probably mark the beginnings of a custom of regular meetings now well established. After commenting briefly on the appointments to the Cabinet, the author dwelt on various practices, such as votes in cabinet, the presentation of written opinions, and the question of admitting outsiders to its sessions. He called attention to the evidence of aid rendered by the advisers (and others) in the matter of preparation of the four annual messages; to the Cabinet's attitude toward the quarrel between Trist

and Scott; to the effort to give Benton the highest military command; and to Polk's practice as to accepting the advice of his regular counsellors, or acting independently of it.

Professor St. George L. Sioussat of Vanderbilt University, in a paper on Tennessee and National Political Parties, 1850-1860, analyzed the relations of the Whig and Democratic parties in Tennessee in the compromise of 1850 and the secession movement of 1849-1851, and devoted special attention to the Nashville convention of 1850. In 1851 the Whigs carried the state by reason of the rivalry in the democratic organization between Aaron V. Brown and A. O. P. Nicholson, of whom Brown gradually drew toward the more extreme Southern position, while Nicholson upheld the compromise of 1850. But the national organization of the Whigs soon went to pieces, though Scott received the electoral vote of Tennessee. From these Whig victories of 1851 and 1853, Tennessee was redeemed by Andrew Johnson of East Tennessee, a man of very different type from the Middle Tennessee leaders. The paper closed with a rapid survey of the politics of Tennessee to 1860, with Andrew Johnson as the central figure.

In the joint session held with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, an interesting feature was a discussion of the origin of the Kansas-Nebraska Act. It was opened by a paper by Professor F. H. Hodder entitled "When the Railroads Came to Chicago". After making a plea for the study of early railroads, the paper traced Stephen A. Douglas's interest in them. In 1836 he made the first move toward the building of railroads in Illinois. In 1845 he proposed a railroad from Chicago to the Pacific. In 1850, by an alliance with the South, he secured the first grant to the states for railroad purposes and at the same time provided a branch road to Chicago. He continuously supported bills to grant land to Iowa, Missouri, and Arkansas for the construction of railroads to connect with proposed Pacific railroads and in the same connection proposed the organization of the western territory. It is reasonable to suppose that he organized Kansas and Nebraska in 1854 for the purpose for which he had urged organization since 1845.

Professor P. Orman Ray of Trinity College, Hartford, in replying to Professor Hodder, contended that the Kansas-Nebraska Act originated in western, particularly Missouri, conditions and in so far as it can be ascribed to any one man was due to the influence of Senator Atchison, rather than to that of Douglas. Any theory of the genesis of the act must explain why it was passed in this

particular year, 1854, and why the provision respecting the Missouri Compromise was added. The answer to both these questions is to be found in the history of the schism in the Democratic party in Missouri, which culminated in the senatorial fight of 1853-1854. He ascribed to Professor Hodder's theory a tendency to attach to certain events an importance out of proportion to that felt by contemporaries, an excessive reliance on the pages of the *Congressional Globe*, and the ignoring of some evidence which conflicted with his view.

In the discussion which followed Professor James A. Woodburn of Indiana University spoke of the fact that other features of the bill had been neglected because of the importance of the repealing section. Mrs. Mathews of the University of Wisconsin expressed the feeling that Professor Ray was emphasizing actual authorship of the bill, Professor Hodder its genesis; agrarian interests played a part also. Professor Sioussat maintained that southern railroad interests likewise had an influence in the history of the bill.

In a valuable and suggestive paper on the Agrarian History of the United States as a Subject for Research, Professor William J. Trimble of the North Dakota Agricultural College took broad ground for the study, not of the technical development of agriculture alone, but of agricultural history in its relation to the whole circle of economic and social history. He laid just emphasis upon its importance. The leading occupation of the American people has been agriculture, yet the history of our agriculture has received little attention. With the rise of scientific agriculture, however, a distinct demand for agrarian history is arising. Agricultural economists in particular insist that such history is indispensable. Questions of agricultural statesmanship, which go to the heart of our country's life, need urgently the light of agrarian history. Yet scarcely more than a beginning has been made. Information is inadequate and often derived from interested sources. A long process of development is needed and the systematic co-operation of many workers. The work can be done only by real historians, having sympathetic understanding of agriculture and rural problems.

It remains to chronicle the conference of historical societies and the conference of archivists. Both of these were marked by real discussion, which had been conspicuously absent from the other sessions of the association.

The former conference was opened with a paper by the chairman, Dr. Otto L. Schmidt, on the Chicago Historical Society, its history, its present activities, and its plans for future work. Dr.

Dunbar Rowland, chairman of the conference's committee on the co-operation of historical societies and departments, reported that the work of calendaring the documents in the French archives concerning the history of the Mississippi Valley, a work which had been going on in Paris under the direction of Mr. Waldo G. Leland, was nearly completed, and would have been entirely finished but for the outbreak of war in Europe.

Professor James A. Woodburn of Indiana University read a paper on Research in State History at State Universities. He held that the state could properly endow and employ its university for the promotion of the study of its history, and favored especially such activities as the collection and publication of materials, the establishment of scholarships, of research fellowships, or of historical commissions of survey to co-operate with the state historical society. Professor Eugene C. Barker of Texas pointed out the important part which the work of the graduate student might have in such endeavors, Professor Orin G. Libby of North Dakota the value they might incidentally have in bringing university men into contact with the larger community. Professor Clarence W. Alvord of Illinois suggested a division of functions between the historical society and the university, whereby the former might devote itself to the publication of materials, the latter of monographs.

A second discussion grew out of a paper by Mr. Lawrence J. Burpee of the Ottawa Public Library on Restrictions upon Use of Historical Materials. Those who took part in the discussion were Dr. George N. Fuller of Michigan, Dr. Milo M. Quaife of Wisconsin, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits of the New York Public Library, Professor Alvord of Illinois, and the secretary of the conference, Dr. Solon J. Buck of the Minnesota Historical Society. The prevailing opinion was in favor of the greatest possible liberality. Dr. Quaife spoke of the inexpediency of lending manuscripts, Mr. Paltsits of the allowable distinctions in treatment, between archival materials and historical papers of private origin.

The conference of archivists, eminently helpful and practical, was attended by about fifty persons. The chairman, Mr. Paltsits, presented a summary report of the Public Archives Commission for 1914. More than two hours were devoted to the consideration of practical problems of archival economy. President Charles H. Rammelkamp of Illinois College, in a paper on Legislation for Archives, dealt with the fundamental laws that are necessary for the archivist and for the preservation of archives, and reviewed legislation enacted in the various states since 1901. A discussion

followed, by Mr. George S. Godard of Connecticut, Professor Harlow Lindley of Indiana, Mr. Ernest W. Winkler of Texas, Mr. James I. Wyer, jr., of New York, Mr. Edgar R. Harlan of Iowa, Mr. Leland, and the chairman. A practical paper, illustrated by diagrams, on the Principles of Classification for Archives, was presented by Miss Ethel B. Virtue, of the Historical Department of Iowa. She upheld the principle of origin, with *respect des fonds*, and demonstrated its application in the classification of the archives of Iowa. This subject was discussed by Mr. Lindley, Mr. Godard, and others, with a virtual unanimity for the system propounded. Mr. Leland spoke informally on Cataloguing of Archives, defining the different kinds of catalogues that should obtain. He distinguished sharply between historical manuscripts and archives, and pointed out that rules for cataloguing the former do not apply to the latter; and also showed the differences between catalogues for official purposes and those for historical purposes, the former varying greatly according to the material, the latter best consisting in a succession of catalogues, beginning with the check-list or *état sommaire*, continuing in the more detailed descriptive catalogue or *inventaire analytique*, and culminating in the calendar.

The annual business meeting, presided over by Professor McLaughlin as president of the Association, began as usual with the report of the secretary, Mr. Leland. He reported a total membership of 2913. The treasurer, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen (treasurer from the first day of the Association's existence), reported net disbursements of \$10,481, as against net receipts of \$9,969. The total assets of the Association were \$26,797, a slight loss in comparison with the preceding year. The report of the Executive Council, presented by its new secretary, Professor Evarts B. Greene, included five recommendations, all of which were adopted by the Association. It recommended that the annual meeting of December, 1916, be held in Cincinnati; that of December, 1915, the Association had already voted to hold in Washington. In deference to recent criticism of the Association's machinery and practices, the Council recommended that a committee of nine be appointed "to consider the constitution, organization, and procedure of the Association, with instructions to report to the annual meeting of 1915", and that a consideration of the relations between the Association and the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW be included in that committee's functions. In response to requests from various organizations of teachers, it recommended that a standing Committee on History in Schools be instituted, to consider questions which have arisen or

may arise in that field, and to replace the present Committee on the Preparation of Teachers of History in Schools. The three-years' grant to the *History Teacher's Magazine* having expired, it recommended that an appropriation of \$400 per annum for two years be made to that journal, conditional upon the raising of an additional guaranty fund of \$600 per annum, the arrangement between the journal and the Association in other respects continuing as adjusted in December, 1911. Finally, the Council recommended, and the Association adopted, the following rule respecting the non-payment of dues:

"The annual dues for the ensuing twelve months are due on September 1. Publications [including the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW] will not be sent to members whose dues remain unpaid after October 15. Members whose dues remain unpaid on March 1 shall be dropped from the roll of the Association."

The budget for 1915 was also presented. The Council announced the re-election of Professor James H. Robinson as a member of the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, he being the member whose term of six years expired at the end of the year 1914, and of Professor Carl L. Becker to fill the unexpired term of Professor McLaughlin, who resigned his membership of the Board.

The report of the Pacific Coast Branch was offered by Professor H. Morse Stephens, of the University of California, who outlined the attractive programme he had constructed for the special meeting to be held by the Association on July 21, 22, and 23, 1915, at San Francisco, Berkeley, and Palo Alto. Brief reports were presented on behalf of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, the chairman of which, Mr. Worthington C. Ford, now resigns that position, and on behalf of the Public Archives Commission by its chairman, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits. A report from the Board of Editors of this journal was presented by Professor Edward P. Cheyney; a report from the Advisory Board of the *History Teacher's Magazine* was read. The Committee on Publications, Professor Farrand, chairman, reported especially as to the series of prize essays, independently published, which has nearly reached the point where it can sustain itself, the sales of the first three books having now run up to more than 500 copies each, while those of the last three amount already to considerably more than 300 each. For the committee on bibliography, its chairman, Dr. Ernest C. Richardson, reported marked progress by a sub-committee on the proposed bibliography of American travels, and the adoption by the Library

of Congress of the proposed joint finding-list of sets of historical periodicals in American libraries. Professor Cheyney, for the committee on a bibliography of modern English history, in course of preparation by two committees, British and American, was obliged to report that the war had compelled a suspension of activity on the part of the British committee. Reports were also made by the general editor of the series of *Original Narratives of Early American History*, by the general committee through its chairman, Professor Frederic L. Paxson, and by the chairman of the committee on the Justin Winsor Prize, Professor Claude H. Van Tyne. The prize was awarded to Miss Mary Wilhelmine Williams, formerly of Stanford University, for an essay entitled "Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, 1815-1914", which will take its place as the ninth volume in the Association's series, next after that of Miss Barbour on the Earl of Arlington. Informal reports had been made from certain other committees, and the series ended with the report of the committee on nominations, presented in print.¹

Perhaps the reviewing of this impressive array of historical business, for which the Association mainly exists, lent sobriety to the discussion which ensued upon the less essential matters of officers and nominations, organization and methods. Probably, too, the submission to the members, on arrival, of printed minutes of the Council's preparatory meeting of November 28, and the subsequent supplying of similar records of Council action at Chicago, enabled members to feel that all Association matters were duly under their review and control. At all events, the discussion was carried on with the utmost good-nature and without any manifestation of feeling. During the year there had been not a little discussion among members, in print, in letters, and in conversation, as to the extent of the dissatisfaction said to prevail in respect to the existing methods of nomination and management.² It cannot be said that the proceedings at Chicago cast any clear light upon this question.

¹ A few copies of this report, and a few copies of the Council minutes mentioned in the next paragraph, and including an abridgment of the treasurer's report and the budget, can still be obtained from the secretary of the Association.

² Under the title, *The Government of the American Historical Association: a Plea for a Return to the Constitution*, Dr. Dunbar Rowland sent out to the members in December a pamphlet containing letters reprinted from the *Nation*, and charging, under thirteen particulars, an unconstitutional control of the Association by the Council. The charges numbered I., VI., VII., VIII., IX., and XIII. relate to points of constitutional law; as to these, since Dr. Rowland reprints the constitution, each reader can judge for himself whether that document, plus the acquiescence of the Association, has warranted the actions mentioned. But it is worth while to state explicitly, for the benefit of members who do not attend meetings, that what are charged under II., III., V., and XII. have not been actions of the Council, that what is mentioned under IV. was fully authorized by the Association, and that there is no foundation in fact for the charges numbered X. and XI.

To the specific inquiry sent out to members, in the circular from this year's committee on nominations, whether the member thought that a substantial change should be made in the method of nominating officers, it is reported by the committee that only 49 out of 182 replies were in the affirmative. Probably whatever dissatisfaction existed was much reduced by the obvious desire of the Council to place itself at the disposal of the Association. No other attitude is proper, and no other was suggested in the November meeting of the Council, in which the recommendation of a revisionary Committee of Nine was voted unanimously. When that proposal was under consideration by the Association, Dr. Dunbar Rowland made an alternative motion for a committee of thirteen, with powers somewhat more widely stated; but the Council's recommendation was preferred, by a vote of 88 to 31. A committee formed on the spot reported at an adjourned session the next morning the nine names: Messrs. E. D. Adams, Connor, Cox, Dunning, Farrand, McLaughlin, Rhodes, Root, and Sullivan. Mr. McLaughlin has since been chosen chairman; Mr. Rhodes has declined to serve upon the committee.

The reference of so many of the Association's affairs to this new committee ought not to obscure the good work done by the committee of nominations, Professor Charles H. Hull chairman, whose printed report has already been mentioned. To the ordinary functions of such a committee the Charleston meeting had added that of formulating "a plan by which the general opinion of the Association on nominations might be more fully elicited". This difficult task the committee had assailed in a most thorough and thoughtful manner, seeking light from the members of the Association and from the experience of similar bodies. The plan which it proposed was that a nominating committee should be chosen a year in advance, not by the Council but by the business meeting; that it should, perhaps when the September bills go out, invite every member to express his preference as to officers; that the committee's nominations be published in advance, perhaps by printing them in the programme; and that the committee prepare, for distribution to attending members, upon their registering at the meeting, a printed ballot, which, in addition to the committee's nominations, should contain such other names as may be proposed, in writing, to the chairman of the committee, by twenty or more members, and should also provide, under each office, a blank space for voting upon such further nominations as may be individually presented on the floor of the business meeting.

The plan thus proposed was adopted for trial in 1915, and the Association appointed a nominating committee of five, whose names appear in the lists at the end of this article, the chairman being Professor Charles H. McIlwain of Harvard.

The committee for 1914 (Professor Hull's committee) nominated, and the Association by ballot elected, the following officers for the ensuing year: president, H. Morse Stephens; first vice-president, George L. Burr; second vice-president, Worthington C. Ford; secretary, Waldo G. Leland; secretary to the council, Evarts B. Greene; treasurer, Clarence W. Bowen; curator, A. Howard Clark. To the six elective memberships in the Council, they elected John M. Vincent, Frederic Bancroft, and Charles H. Haskins (these three by re-election), Eugene C. Barker, Guy S. Ford, and Ulrich B. Phillips. The committees appointed according to custom by the Council are named in the lists at the conclusion of the present article.

Since the terms in which the Committee of Nine received its mandate include a consideration of possible alterations in the relations between the Association and this journal, it is well to state what those relations now are. The REVIEW was brought into existence by a conference of some thirty or forty interested persons, held in April, 1895. These elected the first Board of Editors, who made with the Macmillan Company the contract under which publication still takes place. An association of guarantors was formed, with guaranties running three years. The first number appeared in October, 1895. The association of guarantors confirmed the election of editors, and arranged for six-year terms, one member to be elected each year. Shortly before the expiration of the three years, the Association, which up to that time had had no connection with the REVIEW, made a subvention to it, upon terms which at the New Haven meeting of December, 1898, were amplified into a formal agreement. At that time the REVIEW had about 800 subscribers who were members of the Association, and about 800 who were not; the number of the latter is now about 260. The terms of the agreement were that the successive numbers of the REVIEW should be sent, at a special rate, to all members of the Association, and that the Executive Council of the Association should elect members of the Board of Editors as their terms expired or as vacancies occurred.

The relations thus defined have continued to subsist ever since. The Association assumed no further responsibilities. The editors are responsible for the finances of the journal, and are the con-

tracting party with its publishers. Legally no doubt they are its owners; but this has no practical importance whatever, for the only conceivable course for them to follow is to administer it as virtual trustees for its readers and subscribers and for the whole historical profession in America, or, if one chooses, for the American Historical Association in so far as that body is the constituted representative of such interests. The writer of these pages, though abundantly conscious of the journal's imperfections, believes that it has been managed with a single eye to the interests of its readers and of the historical profession. If under some different constitution it can serve those interests better, he does not expect to see the Board of Editors resisting the amendment.

J. F. J.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION

<i>President</i> ,	Professor H. Morse Stephens, Berkeley, Cal.
<i>First Vice-President</i> ,	Professor George L. Burr, Ithaca.
<i>Second Vice-President</i> ,	Worthington C. Ford, Boston.
<i>Secretary</i> ,	Waldo G. Leland, Carnegie Institution, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.
<i>Treasurer</i> ,	Clarence W. Bowen of New York (address 1140 Woodward Building, Washington).
<i>Secretary to the Council</i> ,	Professor Evarts B. Greene, Urbana, Ill.
<i>Curator</i> ,	A. Howard Clark, Smithsonian Institution.
<i>Executive Council</i> (in addition to the above-named officers):	
Hon. Andrew D. White, ¹	Professor William M. Sloane, ¹
President James B. Angell, ¹	Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, ¹
Henry Adams, ¹	Professor William A. Dunning, ¹
James Schouler, ¹	Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, ¹
James Ford Rhodes, ¹	Professor John M. Vincent, Frederic Bancroft,
Professor John B. McMaster, ¹	Professor Charles H. Haskins,
Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, ¹	Professor Eugene C. Barker,
J. Franklin Jameson, ¹	Professor Guy S. Ford,
Professor George B. Adams, ¹	Professor Ulrich B. Phillips.
Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, ¹	
Professor Frederick J. Turner, ¹	

¹ Ex-presidents.

*Committees:**Committee on Programme for the Thirty-first Annual Meeting:*

Professor Charles D. Hazen, chairman; James F. Baldwin, John S. Bassett, Carl F. Huth, jr., Robert M. Johnston, John H. Latané, Henry B. Learned, Miss Ruth Putnam.

Committee on Local Arrangements: Herbert Putnam, chairman;

Frederic Bancroft, Miss Frances G. Davenport, Mrs. John W. Foster, John B. Henderson, David J. Hill, Henry B. Learned, Waldo G. Leland, Miss Ruth Putnam.

Committee on Programme, Special Meeting, San Francisco,

July 21-23, 1915: Professor Frederic L. Thompson, chairman; Eugene C. Barker, Herbert E. Bolton, Max Farrand, Joseph Schafer, Arley B. Show, Frederick J. Teggart, Payson J. Treat, James F. Willard.

Committee on Nominations: Professor Charles H. McIlwain, Harvard University; Mrs. Lois K. Mathews, University of Wisconsin; Edmond S. Meany, University of Washington; Charles H. Rammelkamp, Illinois College; Alfred H. Stone, Dunleith, Miss.*Editors of the American Historical Review:* Professor Edward P. Cheyney, chairman; Carl Becker, George L. Burr, J. Franklin Jameson, James H. Robinson, Frederick J. Turner.*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Gaillard Hunt, Library of Congress, chairman; Charles H. Ambler, Herbert E. Bolton, Archer B. Hulbert, William O. Scroggs, Justin H. Smith.*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor Carl R. Fish, University of Wisconsin, chairman; George L. Beer, Isaac J. Cox, Allen Johnson, Everett Kimball.*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Professor Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois, chairman; Sidney B. Fay, William R. Shepherd, Paul van Dyke, Albert B. White.*Public Archives Commission:* Victor H. Paltsits, chairman; Clarence W. Alvord, Charles M. Andrews, Solon J. Buck, George S. Godard, Thomas M. Owen, Alexander S. Salley, Jr.*Committee on Bibliography:* Professor Ernest C. Richardson, Princeton University, chairman; Walter Lichtenstein, William W. Rockwell, William A. Slade, Bernard C. Steiner, Frederick J. Teggart.*Committee on Publications:* Professor Max Farrand, Yale University, chairman; and (*ex officio*) Carl R. Fish, Evarts B. Greene, Gaillard Hunt, J. Franklin Jameson, Laurence M.

Larson, Waldo G. Leland, Victor H. Paltsits, Ernest C. Richardson.

General Committee: Professor William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Annie H. Abel, Arthur I. Andrews, William K. Boyd, James M. Callahan, Clarence E. Carter, Carlton H. Hayes, Waldo G. Leland, Robert M. McElroy, William A. Morris, Robert W. Neeser, Edmund S. Noyes, Louis Pelzer, Morgan P. Robinson, Nathaniel W. Stephenson, Eugene M. Violette, Clarence M. Warner.

Committee on a Bibliography of Modern English History: Professor Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Wilbur C. Abbott, Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Conyers Read.

Committee on History in Schools: Professor William S. Ferguson, Harvard University, chairman; Victoria Adams, Henry E. Bourne, Henry L. Cannon, Edgar Dawson, Oliver M. Dickerson, Herbert D. Foster, Samuel B. Harding, Margaret McGill, Robert A. Maurer, James Sullivan.

Conference of Historical Societies: Lyon G. Tyler, chairman; Augustus H. Shearer, secretary.

Advisory Board of the History Teacher's Magazine: Professor Henry Johnson, Teachers College, chairman (re-elected to serve three years); Fred M. Fling, George C. Sellery, St. George L. Sioussat, James Sullivan (these four hold over), Anna B. Thompson (elected to serve three years).

Committee on Military and Naval History: Professor Robert M. Johnston, Harvard University, chairman; Captain Arthur L. Conger, Fred M. Fling, Charles O. Paullin, Captain Oliver L. Spaulding.

Committee on the Military History Prize: Captain Arthur L. Conger, Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, chairman; Milledge L. Bonham, jr., Allen R. Boyd, Fred M. Fling, Albert Bushnell Hart.

Committee of Nine (see p. 523): Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, University of Chicago, chairman; Ephraim D. Adams, Robert D. W. Connor, Isaac J. Cox, William A. Dunning, Max Farrand, Winfred T. Root, James Sullivan, and one member to be elected by the committee.